MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED CASE NO. C 08-0246 MHP k://docs/clients/2084/mot/00086266.doc

## TO: THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES OF RECORD

Pursuant to Local Rule 3-12, Lead Plaintiff the New York City Pension Funds (the "NYC Funds") hereby requests that the Court make a determination that the above-captioned cases are related.

There are currently three separate actions before the Honorable James Ware which assert claims arising from allegations of stock option backdating at Juniper Networks, Inc. ("Juniper"), all of which have been deemed related. These matters are as follows:

Case Name	Case No.
In re Juniper Derivative Actions	C-06-03396 <b>-</b> JW
In re Juniper Networks, Inc. Sec. Litig.	C-06-04327-JW
Calamore v. Juniper Networks, Inc. et al.	C-07-01772-JW

On January 14, 2008, the NYC Funds filed a putative class action titled *The New York City Employees' Retirement System et al v. Berry*, C-08-0246-MHP (N.D. Cal.), as a related case solely for purposes of adding Lisa C. Berry, the former general counsel of Juniper Networks, Inc., as a defendant. The *Berry* complaint asserts claims on behalf of purchasers of Juniper's stock, and alleges violations of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 resulting from her role in the issuance of false financial results and other public misrepresentations that concealed alleged backdating of stock option grants.

Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) provides that "[a]n action is related to another when: (1) The actions concern the same parties, property, transaction or event; and (2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges." This test is satisfied here. The *Berry* complaint contains allegations that are essentially a subset of the allegations contained in the Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint in *In re Juniper Networks, Inc. Securities Litigation*, which is already proceeding before the Honorable James Ware. The cases allege overlapping claims on behalf of an overlapping class of individuals based on identical or substantially similar transactions or events.